

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION N	₹O. 1	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/689,764		10/13/2000	Dan Anders Lindqvist	040020-308	8085
27045	7590	01/03/2005		EXAM	INER
	ON INC.		VO, DON NGUYEN		
6300 LEC M/S EVR	GACY DRIV	/E	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	TX 75024		2631		
ŕ	·			DATE MAILED: 01/03/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		<del></del>				
	•	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		09/689,764	LINDQVIST ET AL.			
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
		DON N VO	2631			
Period fe	The MAILING DATE of this communicatio or Reply	n appears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence address			
THE - External control	MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION OF THIS COMMUNICATION OF THIS COMMUNICATION OF THIS COMMUNICATION OF THE COMMUN	ON.  FR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a recon.  , a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON statute, cause the application to become AB	eply be timely filed  y (30) days will be considered timely.  THS from the mailing date of this communication.  ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)🛛	Responsive to communication(s) filed on	06 July 2004				
2a)□		This action is non-final.				
3)	,		ers, prosecution as to the merits is			
-,	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposit	ion of Claims					
<b>'4)</b> ⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-12,14-22,24 and 25</u> is/are pen	ding in the application.				
,_	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5)□	Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
	Claim(s)					
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
,	Claim(s) are subject to restriction a	and/or election requirement.				
Applicat	ion Papers					
9)	The specification is objected to by the Exa	ıminer.				
-	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)		ov the Examiner			
,	Applicant may not request that any objection t					
•	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the c		, ,			
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
Priority (	under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
_	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fo	reign priority under 35 H S C &	119(a)-(d) or (f)			
	☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:	reight phonty under 55 6.6.6. §	113(a)-(d) or (i).			
u,	1. Certified copies of the priority docu	ments have been received				
	Certified copies of the priority documents of the priority docume	•	nnlication No			
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the	· ·	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
	application from the International B		received in this National Stage			
* 5	See the attached detailed Office action for	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	received			
·	2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2					
Attach	ut(e)		•			
Attachmen  1) Notice	n(s) ce of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Intonious S	ummary (PTO-413)			
	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-94	8) Paper No(s	)/Mail Date			
	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/Ser No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of In 6) Other:	uformal Patent Application (PTO-152)			

Application/Control Number: 09/689,764

Art Unit: 2631

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

#### Acknowledgment

1. This Office Action is responsive to the Amendment filed on 7/6/2004.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. Claims 1-4, 7, 8, 10-12, 14-19, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rich (5,940,452).

Regarding claims 1, 2, 18 and 19; as shown in figures 1, 7 and 11, Rich teaches a diversity receiver apparatus and method therefore comprising at least two receiver branches (114, 133, 135, 118, 126, 116, 137, 139, 120), means for evaluating (108) and means for selecting (108, 146, 148). See also column 4, line 62 to column 6, line 9; column 7, line 53 to column 9, line 67; column 10, lines 33-58; column 12, line 16 to column 13, line 49; column 22, lines 30-41; and column 28, line 60 to column 29, line 42.

Regarding claims 3 and 4, Rich further teaches attenuating the receiver branches. See column 8, lines 27-36; and column 9, lines 55-67.

Regarding claims 7 and 8, Rich further teaches amplifier (135, 139) in each of the receiver branch.

Regarding claims 10-12 and 14, Rich further teaches the evaluating means (108) having memory and selecting based on the comparison of the signal strength. See column 5, lines 31-58; column 9, lines 18-35; and column 10, lines 33-46.

Regarding claims 15-17, Rich further teaches the receiver as mentioned above is part of the transceiver that can be used in base station or radio unit. See column 6, lines 10-48.

Regarding claim 24, Rich further teaches demodulation of I/Q-pair and calculation of signal strength implies the calculation of signal amplitude of the I/Q-pair. See column 8, lines 46-67.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rich (5,940,452).

Rich teaches all subject matter claimed except for un-attenuatting one of the receiver branches. See section 2 above. However, Rich teaches that the attenuations of the receiver branches are controlled by the controller (108) depending on the relationships of the receiver branches. See column 8, lines 27-36; and column 9, lines 55-67. That is, one of the receiver branches can be

chosen not to be attenuated if it is not necessary. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Rich for not to attenuate for one of the receiver branches if it is not necessary.

5. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rich (5,940,452) in view of Tsumura (6,044,253).

Rich teaches all subject matter claimed except for further teaches that the attenuation means includes a resistor network. See section 2 above. However, implementing the attenuation means using the resistor network is well known in the art of digital communications. For example, see column 4, lines 2-6 of reference Tsumura. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Rich by implementing the attenuation means of Rich by using the resistor network as taught by Tsumura since it is just one way of implementing the attenuation means.

6. Claims 9 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rich (5,940,452) in view of Zastera (5,621,770).

Rich teaches all subject matter claimed except for further teaches providing digital filtering means in each of the receiver branches. However, Zastera, from the same field of endeavor and as shown in figure 2, teaches providing the digital

filters in each of the receiver branches for filtering the sampled signals. See column 3, lines 32-42. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Rich by providing the digital filters as taught by Zastera so the system performance can be enhanced since the digital filters will remove noises and provide desired signals.

## Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-12, 14-22, and 24 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

#### Conclusion

- 8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. References McDonald (5,109,392) and Akaiwa et al (5,710,995) are cited because they are pertinent to diversity receiver.
- 9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DON N VO whose telephone number is (571) 272-3018. The examiner can normally be reached on TUE FRI (9:00-6:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, MOHAMMAD GHAYOUR can be reached on (571) 272-3021. The fax

Application/Control Number: 09/689,764

Art Unit: 2631

phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DON N VO Primary Examiner Art Unit 2631 Page 6